www.seyfarth.com

WASHINGTON, D.C.

SAN FRANCISCO

SACRAMENTO

NEW YORK

ios angeles

CHICAGO

SEYFARTH
ATTORNEYS SHAWILD

Writer's direct phone 617-946-4858

Writer's e-mail kmcgurn@seyfarth.com

January 27, 2005

BY HAND

Susan Farbstein, Civil Clerk
United States District Court for
The District of Massachusetts
Moakley U.S. Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way
Boston, MA 02210

Re:

Kevin Kilelee v. Dow Chemical Company

04-CV-12130 MEL

Dear Ms. Farbstein:

Once again, I submit this letter to assert the opposition of Defendant, The Dow Chemical Company ("Dow"), to the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Complaint ("Motion") and supporting papers. According to the docket, Plaintiff's Motion apparently was filed on January 14, 2005, the day after Judge Lasker denied Plainiff's motion for leave to respond to Dow's motion to dismiss and to file an amended complaint. In his January 13, 2005 Order, Judge Lasker pointed out that Plaintiff's attempts to respond to the Motion to Dismiss were tardy, having been lodged after the Court had granted Dow's Motion to Dismiss and closed the case. Plaintiff's Motion is flatly inconsistent with the Court's January 13, 2005 Order and, accordingly, Dow opposes it.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

Kristin G. McGurn

cc:

Sara A. Arons, Esq. David G. Prentiss, Esq. Lisa J. Damon, Esq.